DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 042 SO 011 976

AUTHOR Thompson, Mark B.
TITLE Passionate Intensity and the Educational Process.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; Communism; *Education; Educational History; Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Sociology; Modern History; *Political Influences; Political Socialization; *Politics; *Reactive Behavior; *Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS *McCarthyism; Sputnik I

ABSTRACT

The educational process and passionate intensity are forces that are often at odds in society. Passionate intensity is a force that introduces turmoil and threatens those social processes that depend on reason and independent thought. In contrast, the educational process seeks to develop coping skills to limit dependence on others and promote independent thought, creative thinking, and aesthetic relationships. Political systems often prefer passionate intensity over a controlled, detatched, probing rational inquiry and educational systems are frequently influenced. The eras of McCarthyism and post-Sputnikism are examples of such an interaction of these two forces. During the McCarthy era, careers were destroyed while educators and others stood pliantly by, unwilling to resist the passionate intensity that was reducing independent thought, creativeness, and aesthetic relationships. The period after the launching of Sputnik revealed how environmental pressures can operate with passionate intensity to control the educational process; in this case in the name of national interests. Educational institutions were manipulated to regain a lost sense of national destiny and assure technological supremacy over the USSR by favoring science and technology over aesthetics. Passionate intensity is dangerous because the rational, balanced approach espoused by educational systems can be masked with a sense of urgency in the name of national security or some other such popular, ubiquitous term. (JZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177042

SO

Please send all correspondence to:

Mark E. Thompson, Ed.D
19628 Enterprise Way
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20760

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark E. Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Passionate Intensity and the Educational Process

by

Mark E. Thompson

SP 011 976

Abstract

This essay briefly outlines the American educational process in terms of its relation to social and political arrangements. It is suggested that the educational process can be manipulated by a state of passionate intensity within society. Examples from the eras of McCarthyism and post-Sputnikism are used to illustrate how human potential can be used to satisfy a passionate intensity. References are made to the danger of becoming too dependent on technology. An assumption is made that technology in the hands of bureaucratic institutions can stifle creativity.

Passionate Intensity and the
Educational Process

The educational process is an individual endeavor that can be promoted and controlled by the environment. Educated persons make up institutions that can influence and control events. These institutions are often manipulative and self-serving. Politicans, bureaucrats, and business people function within an environment that may be driven by a state of passionate intensity. They are aided by educators who supply the human potential required to keep institutions vigorous and powerful. In order to exist and be a viable force, educators usually perpetuate the defined social order. This function legitimizes education, but does not necessarily benefit society.

When educators respond to a state of passionate intensity with their own passionate intensity, they may be corrupting the educational process and doing a great disservice. Educators should be firm in promoting independent thought, creativeness, intellectual capacities, and aesthetic relationships all moderated with a reasonable appraoch. Passionate intensity may be responsible for an overreaction that distorts perception and corrupts the spirit. It can be a force that introduces turmoil and throws the social system out of balance. One's perspective may be unconsciously flipped out of focus. The social processes that depend on reason and independent thought may be threatened by the impulsiveness of a passionate intensity. Educators can be influenced by this force in numerous ways. An attempt will be made to briefly explain how this can occur with some specific examples from the eras of McCarthyism and post-Sputnikism.

To identify educated people, we have formal processes--high schools, colleges, vocational, and professional schools. These formal structures graduate people that have certain required skills. Due to individual differences and institutional requirements, graduates have divergent knowledge and ability. As a result, the identification of an educated person is relative to a particular epistemological orientation. By tradition those who graduate with a baccalaureate degree are considered to be educated.

An organized schooling procedure has a tendency to mold people in certain ways. This process is a form of secondary socialization that is carried on beyond the traditional primary socialization accomplished by family units. "Secondary socialization is the internalization of institutional or institutional-based 'subworlds.' Its extent and character are therefore determined by the complexity of the division of labor and the concomitant social distribution of knowledge."[1]

To educate or train is also part of an indoctrination utilized to develop coping skills--obtaining a job and functioning in a complex system without being too dependent on others. Educated people generally have better educated parents, come from small families, live in cities, have better academic records, live longer and are healthier.[2] It has also been reported that educated people are generally more flexible, more motivated, better at problem solving, and more productive.[3] Does the education process teach these attributes, or does it screen out students who do not have these traits? This question is most interesting, and the answer may not be completely clear. An education does teach coping skills, and it does screen out those who do not conform to accepted scholarly requirements.

Society uses education to help identify individuals who are capable and willing to perpetuate desired social arrangements. These arrangements are made

and controlled, for the most part, through institutional relationships. "All transmission of institutional meanings obviously implies control and legitimation procedures."[4] While the education process, in various forms, develops skills, it also promotes a value system of meanings that has been legitimized by institutional structures. Deviants usually are isolated, but occasionally they succeed in creating a following that is tolerated and ultimately causes change. Some classic examples from diverse areas (economics, politics, civil rights, and consumerism) are: Karl Marx, Mahtama Gandhi, Adolf Hitler, Mao Tse-tung, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Ralph Nader.

It is likely that social systems will not tolerate drastic change without considerable turmoil and disruption. Higher education experienced attempts to make abrupt changes during the mid-1960s through the early 1970s, and the system was in distress. A temporary state of feverish delirum was displayed with a passionate intensity. Curriculums were changed and liberal interpretations of academic rules were instituted in an atmosphere of considerable turmoil involving problems of race and war. John Summerskill's experience as the President of San Francisco State College from 1966 to 1968 is an example of the problems administrators faced. Summerskill said, "My life in San Francisco was a desperate, sometimes dangerous attempt to keep the radicals and the reactionaries from each other's throats."[5] Faculty and students were also involved with similar problems that represented a state of passionate intensity in the academy. It is ironic that many educators could not effectively control or manage their institutions during these difficult times. Perhaps the erudite do not have the skill required to deal with enraged groups.

Eric Hoffer said, "Faith, enthusiasm, and passionate intensity in general are substitutes for the self-confidence born of experience and the possession

of skill. Where there is the necessary skill to move mountains there is no need for the faith that moves mountains."[6] Passionate intensity can be a compelling force in the lives of educated people that blinds and distorts. This force is often skillfully manipulated to promote national objectives and strengthen institutional arrangements. "Germany under the Nazis and Japan under the military caste were among the most literate and well-schooled lands on the face of the earth."[7] Their leadership was driven by a passionate intensity for power, and this desire was passed on to the masses through a shallow, simplistic rhetoric with sophisticated methods. The people of Germany and Japan were exposed to intensive propaganda campaigns to promote a particular value system. This is not unique. French revolutionaries attempted to dismantle the Catholic Church in the early 1790s. Bolsheviks in the Soviet Union tried to replace Christianity with Marxism.[8] Catholics and Protestants have been in conflict since the Reformation--Northern Ireland is an extreme contemporary example. East Pakistan became Bangladesh when political independence was gained by the Bengalis--400,000 Bengalis were slaughtered, and about 10 million persons were displaced from their homes.[9] The Middle East is a hotbed of ideological conflict.

A passionate intensity concerning values has contributed to many conflicts at different levels. We should attempt to control events with an open mind and the application of a reasonable approach. This is quite difficult; however, educators have the job to promote these characteristics and maintain stability. It is much easier, and perhaps safer, for educators to follow the pernicious forces of the politican. There are numerous intellectual hucksters eager to please the political hack. These erudite phonies spout obtuse bromides to the naive and gullible at an incredible rate.

A traditional faith in education as a liberator of mankind is not completely justified. Political regimes as well as other institutional forces often prefer faith, enthusiasm, and passionate intensity over a controlled, detached, probing, rational inquiry. "Truth threatens power, and power threatens truth."[10] Goodlad said ". . .the aims of education and the socio-political goals of schooling simply are not the same thing."[11] Education should be a liberating influence used to check political power, but frequently it is the handmaiden of power.[12]

In this country we frequently can observe two or more forces clashing with a passionate intensity; the result is often a compromise resulting in mediocrity. Our free press and institutions of higher education occasionally act to restrain or curb a passionate intensity, but irrevocable damage can be done before an intense force can be checked. McCarthyism in the 1950s burned out after inflicting considerable harm in the lives of creative and talented people. This example of passionate intensity was a turgid force that influenced American society to include educational institutions.

McCarthyism in the 1950s was shorthand for the issue of Communism in government.[13] The Republican Party, with leadership from Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, initially used this issue to attack the Democrats, and they gained considerable attention in the process. Senator McCarthy attempted to identify Communists within the government and concentrated his efforts on the State Department and the United States Army. McCarthy accused prominent government officials of being Communist or pro-Communist, and his attacks became extremely vicious. He went so far as to imply that General George C. Marshall was part of a Communist

conspiracy operating within the United States.[14] Because McCarthy made irrational accusations without evidence, the term McCarthyism has become a synonym for radicalism. Many bright people had their careers destroyed by zealots under the influence of McCarthyism. While this was happening many pliant educators were standing on the sidelines doing nothing to counter the irresponsible activity of Senator McCarthy. The prevailing social atmosphere was ultraconservative, and it was risky to speak out. The trite phrase "to get along you go along" was implicitly understood by many educators during McCarthy's period of influence. The ambitious, phony educator like the bureaucrat will "go along" to gain favor and enhance career opportunities. This happens at all levels of education. Those with the best chance of progressing are polished, quiet, polite, respectful, obliging souls--institutional slaves.

McCarthy got national attention with a speech he made to a Republican Women's Club at Wheeling, West Virginia on February 9, 1950. In this speech he said there were Communists in the State Department (the exact number fluctuated between 58, 81 and 205).[15] This launched McCarthy on a national campaign to find Communists; however, his bullying methods were eventually exposed and countered by the press, a concerned public, and some educators (Robert M. Hutchins is a good example). On December 1, 1954 the Senate voted to censure McCarthy for his outrageous conduct.[16] Less than three years later he died.

During the time Senator McCarthy was investigating Communism in the State Department, many educators feared to oppose him even though his charges were ridiculous. McCarthy accused the State Department of having pro-Communist books in 230 libraries and information centers overseas (about 2,000,000 volumes were involved). In June 1953 the New Republic reported:[17]

> The following Americans have been mentioned unfavorably in testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee or cited by

the Committee as belonging to one or more "fronts," Present directives indicate that their works should be withdrawn from US libraries overseas, and that they should not be the subjects or authors of feature articles or broadcasts distributed or broadcast overseas.

James Truslow Adams
Sherwood Anderson
Roger Baldwin
Charles Beard
Leonard Bernstein
Van Wyck Brooks
Pearl Buck
James Branch Cabell
Erskine Caldwell
Stuart Chase
Marc Connolly
Aaron Copland
Norman Corwin
Clarence Darrow
Eugene Debs
John Dewey
John Dos Passos
Olin Downes
Theodore Dreiser
Max Eastman
Sherwood Eddy
Irwin Edman
Albert Einstein
Morris Ernst
Clifton Fadiman
Louis Fischer
Lewis Gannett
George Gershwin
Frank Graham
Louis Hacker
Roy Harris
Arthur Garfield Hays
Ernest Hemingway
Stanley High
Sidney Hillman
John Hays Holmes
Sidney Hook
Fannie Hurst
Harold Ickes
Alvin Johnson
James Weldon Johnson
Matthew Josephson
Oliver LaFarge
Harold Lasswell
Max Lerner
David C. Lilienthal
Robert and Helen Lynd
Archibald MacLeish
Norman Mailer
Thomas Mann
Burns Mantle
Reginald Marsh
Lewis Mumford
Reinhold Niebuhr
Dorothy Parker
Arthur M. Schlesinger
Budd Schulberg
Upton Sinclair
Norman Thomas
Virgil Thomson
Henry Wallace
Frank Lloyd Wright
Richard Wright
Gregory Zilboorg

It is a fact that some books were burned. "The truth is that book burning in Bombay and Berlin followed a pattern well established in communities in our 48 states."[18] Dashiell Hamett (writer of mystery stories such as The Thin Man and The Maltese Falcon) also had his books banned by the State Department due to his leftist political views.[19] Some of the best minds in this country had their work banned by our government. Independent thought, creativeness, and aesthetic relationships were reduced as the passionate intensity of McCarthyism consumed the government and influenced the public. This was a shameful display.

Conscientious foreign service officers that specialized in the Far East, particularly China, were accused of being pro-Communist and summarily dismissed. John Paton Davies, Jr. and John Stewart Service, brilliant Asian foreign service officers, had their careers destroyed. They had been saying that the Communists were going to win in China and suggested that the United States get ready to deal with the new China.[20] Owen Lattimore, a prominent Far Eastern scholar who had briefly served in the State Department, was attacked by McCarthy. Independent scholarship has always been a dangerous occupation, and it was quite vulnerable in this era of buncombe and passionate intensity.

The House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) was supportive of McCarthy and attempted to identify Communist elements throughout the United States. This committee had been active prior to the era of McCarthyism in attempting to track down Communists. Their methods were harsh and often illegal. "In 1948 J. Parnell Thomas, chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, told a hapless witness: 'The rights you have are the rights given you by this Committee. We will determine what rights you have and what rights you have not got before the committee.'"[21] It has been reported that the HUAC labeled 643 organizations as subversive.[22] Some of these so-called "fronts" were:

American Committee of Protection of Foreign Born
American Peace Crusade
American Women for Peace
China Welfare Appeal
Civil Rights Congress
Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy
Committee for Medical Freedom
Council on African Affairs
Emergency Civil Liberties Committee
National Committee on Peaceful Alternatives
National Committee to Repeal the McCarron Act
National Council of American-Soviet Friendship
National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professors[23]

In May 1953 the American Mercury implied there were numerous Communists within higher education; furthermore, John Dewey, Max Lerner, Albert Einstein,

Gordon W. Alport, Linus Carl Pauling, and Robert S. Lynd were accused of being used by Communists. The following distinguished professors[24] were accused of having had at least ten affiliations with Communist front organizations:

Ernst P. Boas	-	Columbia
Allen M. Bulter	-	Harvard
Percy M. Dawson	-	Stanford
W. W. Denton	-	Arizona
Leslie C. Dunn	-	Columbia
Leo Eloesser	-	Stanford
W. Horsley Gantt	-	Johns Hopkins
Harry Grundfest	-	Columbia
Alice Hamilton	-	Harvard
Robert J. Havighurst	-	Chicago
I. M. Kolthnoff	-	Minnesota
Walter Landauer	-	Connecticut
Paul H. Lavietes	-	Yale
Oliver Loud	-	Antioch
Philip Morrison	-	Cornell
Stuart Mudd	-	Pennsylvania
Theodor Rosebury	-	Washington University
T. C. Schneirla	-	New York University
Harlow Shapley	-	Harvard
Henry E. Sigerist	-	Yale
Maud Slye	-	Chicago
Dirk J. Struik	-	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Oswald Veblen	-	Institute for Advanced Study
Goodwin Watson	-	Columbia
Gene Weltfish	-	Columbia
F. W. Weymouth	-	Stanford

Many scholars lost their jobs by being implicated with Communism. Lloyd Barenblatt, a psychology teacher at Vassar, was summoned in June 1954 to appear before a HUAC subcommittee. After he was summoned his contract expired, and it was not renewed.[25] J. Robert Oppenheimer, the brilliant physicist ~~that~~ who was in charge of our technical program to develop the first atomic bomb in Los Alamos, had his security clearance revoked by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1954. He was accused of being lefist in his political philosophy. Actually the government knew of Oppenheimer's association with leftists when his original clearance was granted to work on the atomic bomb. The Federal Government used its power to bring Oppenheimer to his knees during a period of suspicion and

fear.[26] A state of passionate intensity was capable of denigrating the career of a brilliant and loyal scientist. This satanic force spread throughout the country and promoted anxiety and suspicion in many areas.

Blacklisting by artists in the theater, television, radio, and the screen was a byproduct of McCarthyism. Suspect artists had been subjected to investigations by HUAC in 1938 and 1947, but in the 1950s these investigations were stepped up. Robert Vaughn conducted a scholarly investigation into blacklisting, and he defined the term. ". . .the word 'blacklisting' refers to the unwritten understanding among persons in a position to employ theater artists that they would not hire these artists if (1) they had been named as current or former Communists during the committee [HUAC] hearings or (2) if when testifying before the committee, the artist refused to answer questions by claiming constitutional immunity."[27] Many well known artists were blacklisted: Will Greer, Philip Loeb, Larry Adler, John Henry Faulk, Pete Seeger, Zero Mostel, Jack Gilford, Larry Parks, Joseph Cotton, Judy Holiday, John Garfield, Jose Ferrer, Edward G. Robinson, Henry Morgan, and Kim Hunter. For some it was a devastating experience. Philip Loeb committed suicide in despair. Mady Christians (the Mama of I Remember Mama), John Garfield, and Canada Lee died while in a state of depression about being blacklisted.[28]

Artists that cooperated with HUAC usually were not blacklisted. Cooperating meant informing on friends and associates. Some notable informers were: Elia Kazan, Budd Schulberg, Lee J. Cobb, Sterling Hayden, and Artie Shaw. "Blacklistees still love to recount Zero Mostel's greeting to Kazan at a backstage encounter: 'Hello, Looselips.'"[29] Lucille Ball was registered as a Communist in the Los Angeles primary election of 1936, but avoided being blacklisted. I Love Lucy was a big television hit, and CBS had just paid Lucy and Desi $8,000,000.00 for a 30-month contract when the HUAC investigated Lucy.[30]

Arthur Miller refused to inform on his friends and a contempt of Congress citation was issued to him on July 25, 1956. Lilliam Hellman was also investigated by HUAC, but she refused to implicate others.[31]

Many blacklisted artists were able to resume their careers after a period of time. Will Greer became a television star as grandpa on The Waltons. Jose Ferrer, Edward G. Robinson, and Kim Hunter had relatively brief periods as blacklistees. They were big stars and did not have as much difficulty as did Pete Seeger, Jack Gilford and Sam Mostel. Sam (Zero) Mostel claims he got his nickname as a result of his financial standing while being blacklisted and out of work.[32] Many blacklisted writers continued to work under ficitious names. Michael Wilson and Carl Foreman wrote the screen play for The Bridge on the River Kwai under a pseudonym (Pierre Boulle).[33]

One of the most vicious blacklisting attempts that has been exposed involved John Henry Faulk. Faulk was a successful radio and television personality in New York City when he was attacked by AWARE, a vigilante blacklisting organization operated by Lawrence Johnson and Vincent Hartnett. Faulk was attacked, because he was attempting to curb the tactics of AWARE through the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists. From 1956 until he won a libel judgment in 1962, John Henry Faulk could not get work as a performer. He won a $3,500,000.00 libel suit, but his career was damaged.* Edward R. Murrow contributed $7,500.00 to help pay legal fees. Other show business friends such as David Susskind, Tony Randall, Myrna Loy, Kim Hunter, and Mark Goodson came to his defense.[34] "In effect, CBS now admits that it lied in saying that Faulk was fired because of alleged 'poor ratings' and that in truth he was sacrificed to political hoodlums who slanderously accused Faulk of pro-communism."[35] This is a good example of the extent and magnitude that

---

*John Henry Faulk currently works on radio programs in Texas and regularly appears on the television show "Hee Haw."

a state of passionate intensity can have. It is curious that while our institutions of education stress freedom of expression, this notion is often not promoted by politicians, bureaucrats, and business people. Taking up an unpopular cause may be twisted into Un-Americanism. Education may be more of an indoctrination process than an approach to reasonable behavior. One may question the value of an education that does not consistantly promote and respect independent thought and reason. John Henry Faulk paid dearly for the right to speak his mind.

Faulk reflected on this period in his life and had this to say:

> To me, the most sinister aspect of that whole period was the systematic way respectable educators, ministers, artists, writers, librarians--Americans from every walk of life--were hauled in by some committee or publicly denounced by some vigilante group, and pronounced "guilty." Guilty for having thought and acted like responsible citizens. The terrible thing is that many of those so victimized, and the American people as a whole, accepted this sentence of "guilty." They accepted the right of the vigilantes to bring the charges, to make the decision, and to pronounce the sentence. Those very attributes which had for so long been held to be marks of civic virtue in a citizen, suddenly became sufficent cause to suspect and punish him. Citizens came to accept the dictum that a concern about injustices was a greater crime than the injustices themselves. And we all kept quiet. Silence became our greatest virtue. We felt that silence would make us safe. What a paradox! Silence was precisely what exposed us to the worst ravages of vigilantes. The habit of keeping quiet is still on us. Blacklisting still goes on.[36]

A creative spirit desires to duel in an environment unfettered by political or social customs. It has been observed ". . .that creative persons are relatively uninterested in small details, or in facts for their own sake, and more concerned with their meanings and implications, possessed of considerable cognitive flexibility, verbally skillful, interested in communicating with others and accurate in so doing, intellectually curious, and relatively disinterested in policing either their own impulses and images or those of others."[37] Creativity usually does not flourish in an atmosphere of passionate intensity.

Freedom to create and conduct one's affairs in an open system can be stimulating and productive. "The free man. . .believes in destiny and believes that it stands in need of him."[38] The slave is usually tied to ordinary routine and functions in a repressive vacuum. Slaves do what they are told and keep quiet. A state of passionate intensity is capable of producing a form of educated slave. This kind of slave represents the failure of our educational system.

There are environmental pressures that can operate with a passionate intensity to control the educational process in the name of national interests. As an example, considerable pressure to produce more scientists was applied to educational institutions in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a result of fear triggered by a Russian orbiting space vehical launched October 4, 1957. About one month later the United States Office of Education released an impressive two-year study indicating the United States was behind Russia in producing scientific talent.[39] Congress quickly took action through the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to see that money was available for upgrading the background of teachers and students in the areas of science, mathematics, foreign languages, counseling, and guidance. This legislation was introduced on January 30, 1958 and was approved September 7, 1958.[40] Senator Wayne Morse said, "It is quite true that action by Congress in this field [education] has been stimulated by the Russian sputniks."[41] On January 23, 1958, Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, President of the California Institute of Technology, said, "The U.S.S.R. presents us today not only with a challenge of military supremacy, but also with the challenge of technological, and scientific, and intellectual supremacy as well."[42] This type of rhetoric was used to manipulate educational institutions. The government was determined to extract its version of independent thought and creativeness. During this period aesthetics were ignored, and in many quarters artistic endeavors were thought to be the product of tender minded

dilettantes. The nostrums of science and technology were to be applied with vigor by technocratic Philistines. Our institutions of education became factories for the technocrat.

Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, Edward Teller, Max Rafferty, James B. Conant, and other critics took our educational system to task for allowing the Russians to gain the upperhand in a so-called space race.[43] This technological coup d'etat by the Soviet Union was a shocking experience for a country that had come to see itself as the most powerful nation on earth, destined to lead the way toward a world-wide democracy. A passionate, nationalistic sense of duty in the rhetoric of American politicians was used to convince the public that action was required. Senator Irving M. Ives said:

> We are going to lick the Russians and let us not forget it. I am not talking about war, but I am talking about scientific advance. We have the ingenuity in this country, and we have the knowhow, and we have everything it takes and we have the will to do it. I know the American people will rise up and do it.[44]

This kind of egocentric thinking, perpetuated by erudite but arrogant men like McGeorge Bundy and Walt Rostow, was used to set up a strawman in Southeast Asia which lead to military debauchery in Vietnam--a tragic effort of passionate intensity that spawned a counter force responsible for disengagement.* The result was confusion and apathy.

In September 1959 a group of 35 scientists, scholars, and educators met at Woods Hole on Cape Cod to discuss how education in science might be improved in primary and secondary schools. Jerome S. Bruner was the director of this ten-day meeting called by the National Academy of Sciences. Financial support for this conference came from the National Academy of Sciences, the United

---

*David Halberstam presents an in-depth analysis of the leadership that was responsible for Vietnam, and he concluded that Robert McNamara, the efficient Secretary of Defense, was a fool (The Best and the Brightest, Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, 1973, p. 306.). The so-called "best and brightest" had deceitfully manipulated the public, the Congress, and the press from the very start of the Vietnam involvement in the early 1960s according to Halberstam.

States Office of Education, the United States Air Force, and the RAND Corporation.[45] This effort was in response to a national call for more technical experts. Bruner said, "The intention was not to institute a crash program, but rather to examine the fundamental process involved in imparting to young students a sense of the substance and method of science."[46] Actually a crash program was already in progress, and it is hard to believe that this conference was not a part of that overall effort. Bruner reported that the opening days were devoted to round-the-clock series of progress reports of various curriculum projects.[47] A popular little book, The Process of Education, by Bruner reported on the educational concepts that were synthesized as a result of the conference. Bruner speculated that there would ". . .be a long-range crisis in national security, a crisis whose resolution will depend upon a well-educated citizenry."[48] The definition of a properly educated citizenry depends on one's perspective of the world. Carl Rogers, a humanistic psychologist with clinical experience, said, "Changingness, a reliance on process rather than upon static knowledge, is the only thing that makes any sense as a goal for education in the modern world."[49] Will Durant said that the most essential thing in the universe is creative power.[50]

Bruner, the eager minion of educational change, willingly set forth the path that education should follow. Technological supremacy became a palliative for the faithful. Educators quickly perceived the new direction that was being fostered by the government and came up with the appropriate rhetoric and adornments in order to receive federal grants.

Starting in the late 1950s the Federal Government, with the help of professional educators, worked hard to manipulate the educational system to provide skilled manpower for a global technological race with the Soviet Union. The race to produce atomic weapons was already in progress. A spirit of

military competition was exacerbated; there was a fear in this country that eventually we could be conquered by the Russians in some way. The educational system was being manipulated with a passionate intensity, and educators marched as required. Our destiny seemed to be in danger, and more scientists were thought to be needed for future conflicts. We were going to arm ourselves with sophisticated technology. The educational system could just as well have been used to produce more humanistic psychologists, social historians, or philosophers if our national leaders were convinced of the need. Through the bureaucratic haze of big government ". . .our schools are viewed as factories, the teachers as factory workers, and the students as products to be shaped as quickly and efficiently as possible."[51] Toynbee said, "In the present-day world the principal conditioner is likely to be technology rather than religion and some of the products of technology are certainly well adapted to prepare human beings for acquiesence in a dictatorial world government."[52]

Considerable effort was made to rapidly advance our technological knowledge through the educational institutions. Politically this was an important issue.

> In the Presidential campaign of 1960 the role of the Federal Government in education was a major issue. The Democratic and Republican parties palced conspicuous planks on education in their platforms. Both party candidates for the Presidency repeatedly expressed views concerning education. Both advocated new forms of Federal aid to education. The issue was not whether the Federal Government should offer greater support to education but in what forms such support should be given.[53]

John F. Kennedy campaigned on themes relating to a need for vigorous action. "If we continue to stand still--if we continue to lie at anchor--if we continue to sit on dead center--if we content ourselves with the easy life and the rosy assurances--then the gates will soon be open to a lean and hungry enemy."[54] The night before the Presidential election Kennedy said, "I believe that we

can fulfill our function. I believe we can maintain our position as the hope of freedom. I believe that we can check the Communist advance, that we can turn it back, and that we can in this country, provide for the ultimate victory of freedom over slavery."[55] The idea of "new frontiers" appealed to the American competitive spirit. This pioneer ethos was called up by Kennedy for political advantage. Kennedy's vigorous leadership coupled with the threat (real or imagined) of Soviet supremacy in space exploration produced bumper crops of technical people that eventually landed two men on the moon July 20, 1969. We had made it possible to go to the moon, but it was not safe for black children to attend some schools in this country.

It is a tragic paradox that while we were making spectacular achievements in space, we were also losing a protracted guerrilla war in Vietnam. A vast arsenal of weapons and overwhelming technological superiority could not subdue the human spirit of a determined people. Our educational institutions had not prepared us for this catastrophe. A tenacious human spirit had conquered our exalted technology. The nation was divided and bitter when the end finally came. We had invested heavily in technology, but in the case of Vietnam our technology misled us. Some errors had been made--perhaps there had been too much faith in technology. Hans J. Morgenthau said that ". . .technologies have given modern governments the tools with which to penetrate and overwhelm the sphere that tradition has reserved for the individual and his freedom--to condition his thoughts and control his actions without limitation from outside."[56] It is possible for technology to become a monolith with an inertia that is uncontrollable within the confines of business and government. The human spirit can be deceived with the dazzle and promise of organizational perfection on the horizon. "A triumphant technology ushers in a psychological age, and history is made not by the hidden hand of circumstances but by men. For the mass of people the denouement of technological progress is a passage

from servitude to things to the more demeaning servitude to men."[57] Technology can be used with a passionate intensity to manipulate and control. This is most important for educators to understand, for we are now living in an environment that can use subtle and insidious methods to mask the passionate intensity of arrogance and power politics.

With the fall of Vietnam came the fall of a President. The Watergate scandel contributed to a distrustful mood.* Our leadership was vulnerable, and our technology was vulnerable. An examination of our educational institutions and their products is being conducted again. Where had we gone wrong? Law schools have sought to introduce courses emphasizing moral and ethical principles. Curriculums are being revised. Harvard is reemphasizing liberal arts education with their concept of a core curriculum.[58] A back to the basics movement is now popular in primary and secondary schools. National minimum competency testing is being seriously considered. "It is a sad commentary on our national lack of imagination that we are responding to poor test performance by our children by making them take yet one more test."[59] Learning to take tests seems to be a major educational objective. Promoting spirited minds and independent thinkers is usually not given emphasis, because it is much easier to set up the educational assembly line and push students through. The happy robot is no threat to institutional formalities we have created.

Montaigne said, "A spirited mind never stops within itself; it is always aspiring and going beyond its strength; it has impulses beyond its powers of

---

*Kenneth B. Clark said, "Watergate must be understood in the context of a society in which a vast majority of the American middle class, working class, and economic, social, and intellectual elites have knowingly bargained away their fundamental values, ideals, rights, and liberties, to political officials who promised to reward their greed and pandered to their primitive passions and prejudices. [. . .] Even the most intelligent of human beings can be seduced and purchased by the lure, the glamour, and the glitter of power. It is not difficult to understand how social scientists themselves can be deflected from their obligatory role of social critic into the safer role of social apologist." (Pathos of Power, New York: Harper and Row, 1974, p. 123 and p. 125.).

achievement. If it does not advance and press forward and stand at bay and clash, it is only half alive. Its pursuits are boundless and without form; its food is wonder, the chase, ambiguity."[60] Our educational institutions should be interested in spirited minds. Bureaucrats and lofty educational technocrats have consideralbe influence, and they attempt to channel youth into predictable patterns that can be used for political reasons. Politics is synonymous with power. Humans come to be viewed as things to be manipulated--if we need more technology, then we produce scientists like loaves of bread. A perverse arrangement occurs whereby technology dominates and becomes a master of sophisticated fools. The creation of technology dictates more technology. Humanistic and aesthetic concerns seem to be reduced as a technology is enlarged. The regimented systems approach with inputs, process, outputs, and feedback attempts to organize and control human potential. Political groups do not want spirited minds that challenge and probe; they want obedient, disciplined minds that produce on command. Creative thinkers are usually individualistic by temperament. As a student H. G. Wells was undisciplined and suffered periods of melancholia at various stages in his life. Wittgenstein was often disorganized and obtuse. Albert Einstein was an outspoken student and was not given recommendations by many professors when he finished his graduate studies. Einstein was lucky to find work as a civil servant when he graduated. Albert Schweitzer (writer, musician, theologian, missionary, physician, and humanitarian) had a most unconventional life style. "Even in the freest society power is charged with the impulse to turn men into precise, predictable automata. When watching men of power in action it must be always kept in mind that, whether they know it or not, their main purpose is the elimination or neutralization of the independent individual--the independent voter, consumer, worker, owner, thinker--and that every device they employ aims at turning man into a

manipulatable 'animated instrument', which is Aristotle's definition of a slave."[61]

Passionate intensity is a potentially dangerous characteristic that can control and corrupt our educational process. The rational, balanced approach can be masked with a sense of urgency in the name of national security or some other popular, ubiquitous term. It is also true that passionate intensity stifles creativity and spontaneity. Sometimes it is useful to play-off one form of passionate intensity with another, but usually nothing of value results.

Educators should be sensitive to institutional inertia that can sweep people off their feet with the use of passionate intensity as a substitute for a questioning, free spirit. A regimented environment can cause atrophy in the human spirit. We need thinkers with an iconoclastic bite to help us develop our potential and understand our limitations.

NOTES

1. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Doubleday, 1966), p. 138.

2. Mark Blaug, An Introduction to the Economics of Education (London: Penguin Press, 1970).

3. Ibid.

4. Berger and Luckmann, Social Construction, p. 71.

5. John Summerskill, President Seven (New York: World Publishing Company, 1971), p. vii.

6. Eric Hoffer, The Ordeal of Change (New York: Harper and Row, 1952), p. 4.

7. George S. Counts, "A Rational Faith in Education" in Readings In Curriculum ed. by G. Hass, K. Wiles, and J. Bondi (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973), p. 125.

8. Charles F. Andrain, Political Life and Social Change (Belmont, California: Duxbury Press, 1975).

9. John E. Owen, "The Emergency of Bangladesh." Current History, 63 (November 1972).

10. Hans J. Morgenthau, Truth and Power (New York: Praeger, 1970), p. 14.

11. John I. Goodlad, "On the Cultivation and Corruption of Education," The Educational Forum, 42(3), 1978, p. 269.

12. According to Kenneth B. Clark there are many influential educators and social scientists that use their position to defend the social system in this country and enhance their own estates: "Some individuals, such as Daniel P. Moynihan himself, will be flagrant and direct in their for-hire role in exchange for rewards of prestige, publicity, and power. Others, such as Jensen, Banfield, Forrester, Armor, and Jencks will be more indirect. Still others, such as Bell and Glazer, will be more subtle and polysyllabic apologists for the status quo." (Pathos of Power, New York: Harper and Row, 1974, p. 130.)

13. Robert Griffith, The Politics of Fear (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970).

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. New Republic, "A Special New Republic Report On Book Burning." June 29, 1953, p. 8.

18. Ibid., p. 9.

19. Richard M. Fried, Men Against McCarthy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

20. David Halberstam, The Best and The Brightest (Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett Publications, 1973).

21. J. Parnell Thomas quoted by James Hamilton, The Power to Probe (New York: Random House, 1976), p. 246.

22. Robert F. Vaughn, Only Victims: A Study of Show Business Blacklisting (New York: G. P. Putman's Son, 1972).

23. J. B. Matthews, "Communism and The Colleges," American Mercury, 76(352), May 1953, p. 118.

24. Ibid., p. 130.

25. Hamilton, Power to Probe.

26. Philip M. Stern, The Oppenheimer Case: Security On Trial (New York: Harper and Row, 1969).

27. Vaughn, Only Victims, p. 19.

28. Stefan Kanfer, A Journal Of The Plague Years (New York: Antheneun, 1973).

29. Ibid., p. 287.

30. Ibid., p. 208.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. John Henry Faulk, Fear On Trial (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1964).

35. Karl E. Meyer, "CBS Tries Itself," Saturday Review, 3(1) October 4, 1975, p. 38. On October 2, 1975 CBS presented a two-hour documentary on John Henry Faulk.

36. Faulk, Fear On Trial, p. 398.

37. Donald W. Mackinnon, "The Study of Creative Persons: A Method and Some Results" in Creativity and Learning ed. by J. Kagan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967), p. 31.

38. Martin Buber, I and Thou translated by R. G. Smith (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937), p. 59.

39. Benjamin Fine, "Soviet Education Far Ahead of U.S. In Science," New York Times. November 11, 1957, p. 1.

40. Operation of the National Defense Education Act and Proposal For Its Amendment and Extension: A Report Prepared for the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee On Labor and Public Welfare United States Senate, 87th Congress: 1st Session, Committee Print. (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1961).

41. Hearings Before the Committee On Labor and Public Welfare, United Sates Senate. Eighty-Fifth Congress, Second Session on Science and Education for National Defense (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1958), p. 1138.

42. Ibid., p. 37.

43. Hyman G. Rickover, American Education--A National Failure (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1963) and Education and Freedom (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1959). Hearings Before The Committee On Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. Eighty-Fifth Congress, Second Session on Science and Education for National Defense. Max Rafferty, What They Are Doing to Your Children (New York: New American Library, 1963). James B. Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

44. Hearings on Science and Education for National Defense, p. 4.

45. Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (New York: Random House, 1963).

46. Ibid., p. vii.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., p. 1.

49. Carl Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1969), p. 104.

50. Will Durant quoted in "Durants on History: From the Ages, With Love" by P. Proctor, Parade: The Sunday Newspaper Magazine, August 6, 1978, p. 12.

51. Goodlad, "On the Cultivation," p. 269.

52. Arnold Toynbee, Surviving The Future (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 116.

53. Operation of the Nation Defense Education Act, p. 2.

54. Wayne Phillips, "Kennedy Rejects Charge of Downgrading America," New York Times. November 1, 1960, p. 1.

55. New York Times, November 8, 1960, p. 18.

56. Morgenthau, Truth and Power, p. 219.

57. Eric Hoffer, "Works and Days: The Labor of Daily Thought: 1974-1975." Harpers (October 1978), p. 78.

58. James Q. Wilson, "Harvard's Core Curriculum: A View From the Inside," Change. 10(10), November 1978.

59. Gordon Carwelti, "National Competency Testing: A Bogus Solution," Phi Delta Kappan, 59(9), May 1978, p. 621.

60. Michel E. Montaigne, The Complete Essays of Montaigne translated by D. M. Frame (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 818.

61. Hoffer, Ordeal of Change, p. 97.